UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/786,286	03/02/2001	Byron C. Darrah	149.1-US-WO	7028

7590 06/17/2005

Steven W. Smyrski, Esq.
Smyrski & Livesay, LLP
3310 Airport Avenue, SW
Santa Monica, CA 90405-6118

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, THANH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/786,286	DARRAH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tammy T. Nguyen	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed November 1, 2004.

2. Claims **1-34** are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gene D. Kevner., (USPN September 21, 1999– Date of Patent: 5,956,509, herein referred to as "Kevner").

5. As to claim 29, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of defining a client process (204) having a remote procedure (214) remotely executable in a remote processor (220) from the client process (204) executed in a local processor (218),

comprising the steps of: accepting remote procedure definition information including a global remote procedure locator and information identifying the remote procedure (2 14) (col.7, line 60 to col.8, line 10); compiling a stub for communicating between the client process (204) and a client application program interface (206) (AP1) from the remote procedure information (Fig.2, col.2, lines 35-45, and col.8, lines 40-50); compiling a shell for communicating between the remote procedure (214) and an agent API (212) from the remote procedure information (Abstract, col.1, lines 33-50); compiling an API procedure from the remote procedure definition information (col.2,lines 35-45); compiling a client API from the client process (204), the API procedure, and the client stub (Abstract, col.10, lines 10-20) ; and compiling an agent API (2 12) from the remote procedure (214), the API procedure, and the shell (abstract, col.1, lines 33-50) .

6. As to claim 30, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the remote procedure definition information further comprises at least one remote procedure input attribute and at least one remote procedure output attribute (col.14, lines 32-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-28, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gene D. Kevner., (hereinafter Kevner) U.S. Patent No. 5,956,509 in view of Bao Q. Tran et al., (hereinafter Tran) U.S. Patent No. 6,202,060.

9. As to claim 1, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of executing a remote procedure (214) in a remote processor (220) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (218), comprising the steps of: accepting a remote procedure call identifying the remote procedure (214) including a global remote procedure locator (col.7, line 60 to col.8, line 5); transmitting the translated remote procedure call to the remote processor (220) (col.9, lines 20-25); interpreting the translated remote procedure call into a remote procedure-compatible format (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, and Fig.8A, 8B); and invoking the remote procedure (214) in the remote processor (220) (col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

10. As to claim 2, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the remote procedure call further comprises a remote procedure input value and the remote procedure is invoked to produce at least one remote procedure output value from the remote procedure input value (col.14, lines 31-39).

11. As to claim 3, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: transmitting the remote procedure response to the local processor (218) (col.9, lines 20-25); interpreting the remote procedure response to a client process-compatible format (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, and col.9, lines 1-8); and providing the translated remote procedure response to the client process (204) (col.9, lines 20-25). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

12. As to claim 4, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the global remote procedure locator is a universal resource locator (URL) (col.7, line 60 to col.8, line 5).

13. As to claim 5, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the CGI-compatible information transfer protocol is a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) transmitted to the remote process via the Internet (col.6, lines 1-10).

14. As to claim 6, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the translated remote procedure call is transmitted to the remote process via the internet (col.6, lines 1-10).

15. As to claim 7, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the remote procedure call is translated into a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol via a first application program interface (API), and the translated remote procedure call is interpreted by a second application program interface (API) (col.8, lines 55-65).

16. As to claim 8, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of executing a remote procedure (214) in a remote processor (220) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (218), comprising the steps of: accepting a remote procedure call having information identifying the remote procedure (2 14) including a global remote procedure locator (col.7, line 60 to col.8, line 5); transmitting the translated remote procedure call to the remote processor (220) (col.9, lines 20-25); and receiving a remote procedure response at the local processor (218) (col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between

a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

17. As to claim 9, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the remote procedure call further comprises a remote procedure input value, and the remote procedure response comprises a remote procedure output value generated by invoking the remote procedure (col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, liens 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30).

18. As to claim 10, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the global remote procedure locator is a universal resource locator URL (col.7, line 60 to col.8, line 5).

19. As to claim 11, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the CGI-compatible information transfer protocol is a hypertext transfer protocol (col.6, lines 1-10).

20. As to claim 12, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the translated remote procedure call is transmitted to the remote processor (220) via the Internet (col.6, lines 1-8).

21. As to claim 13, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of executing a remote procedure (214) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (21 8), comprising the steps of: accepting a remote procedure call, the remote procedure call having information identifying the remote procedure (214) including a global remote procedure locator (col.9, lines 43-53); interpreting the remote procedure call into a remote procedure-compliant format (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, and Fig.8A, 8B); and invoking the remote procedure (214) in the remote processor (220) (col.col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30). But Kever does not

teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

22. As to claim 14, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the remote procedure call comprises at least one remote procedure input value, and the remote procedure is invoked to produce at least one remote procedure output value from the remote procedure input value (col.14, lines 35-39).

23. As to claim 15, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: and transmitting the remote procedure response so that the remote procedure output value becomes available to the client process (204) (col.14, lines 35-39). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is

designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

24. As to claim 16, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the remote procedure call is transmitted in a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) (col.6, lines 1-10).

25. As to claim 17, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the remote procedure call is transmitted via the Internet (col.6, lines 1-10).

26. As to claim 18, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a gateway for executing a remote procedure (214) in a remote processor (220) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (218), comprising: a client application program interface (206) (col.8, lines 55-65); for translating a remote procedure call having information identifying the remote procedure (214) including a global remote procedure locator (col.9, lines 45-55), for transmitting the translated remote procedure call to the remote processor (220), and for interpreting a remote procedure response into a client process-compatible format (col.1,lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8); an agent application program interface (212) (Fig.2 host 104); for interpreting a remote procedure call translated by the client application program interface (206) into a remote procedure-compatible format (col.1,lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, and Fig.8A, 8B), for invoking the remote procedure (214) in the remote processor (220) to produce a remote procedure response (col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30); and wherein the client application program interface (206) is communicatively coupled to the agent application program interface (212) (Fig.2, client 102 coupled to host 104). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information

transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

27. As to claim 19, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein: the remote procedure call further includes at least one remote procedure input value; the remote procedure response includes at least one remote procedure output value; and the remote procedure is invoked to produce the remote procedure output value from the remote procedure input value (col.14, lines 35-40).

28. As to claim 20, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the global remote procedure locator is a universal resource locator (URL) (col.9, lines 45-55).

29. As to claim 21, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein information transfer protocol is a hypertext transfer protocol HTTP (col.6, lines 1-10).

30. As to claim 22, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the client application program interface (206) is communicatively coupled to the agent application program interface (212) via an internet connection (col.6, lines 1-10).

31. As to claim 23, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the client application program interface (206) further comprises a stub for accepting the remote procedure call

from the client process (204) and for providing the remote procedure response to the client process (204) (col.8, lines 55-65).

32. As to claim 24, kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the agent application program interface (2 12) further comprises a shell for providing the interpreted remote procedure call translated by the client application program interface (206) to the remote procedure (214), and for accepting the remote procedure response having the remote procedure output value (col.14, lines 32-40).

33. As to claim 25, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a gateway for executing a remote procedure (214) in a remote processor (220) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (218), comprising: a client application program interface (206) (col.8, lines 55-56), for translating a remote procedure call having information identifying the remote procedure (214) including a global remote procedure locator (col.9, lines 45-55), for transmitting the translated remote procedure call to the remote processor (220), for interpreting a remote procedure response into a client process-compatible format (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, fig.8A, 8B); and wherein the client application program interface (206) is communicatively couple able with an agent application program interface (212) for interpreting a remote procedure call translated by the client application program interface (206) into a remote procedure-compatible format, for invoking the remote procedure (214) in the remote processor (220) to produce a remote procedure response (col. 21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40); the remote procedure response includes at least one remote procedure output value (col.14, lines 32-40); and the remote procedure is invoked to produce the remote

procedure output value from the remote procedure input value (col.1, lines 30-40, and col.14, lines 32-40). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

34. As to claim 26, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein: the remote procedure call further includes at least one remote procedure input (col.14, lines 32-40).

35. As to claim 27, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the CGI-compatible information transfer protocol is a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) (col.6, lines 5-10).

36. As to claim 28, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a gateway for executing a remote procedure in a remote processor (220) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (218), comprising: an agent application program interface (212) for interpreting a remote procedure call translated by a client application program interface (206) into a remote procedure-compatible format (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, fig.8A, 8B); for invoking the remote procedure (214) in the remote processor (220) to produce a remote procedure response (col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30); and wherein the agent application program

interface (212) is communicatively coupled to a client application program interface (206) for translating a remote procedure call having information identifying the remote procedure (214) including a global remote procedure locator for transmitting the translated remote procedure call to the remote processor (220) (col.9, lines 20-25); and for interpreting a remote procedure response into a client process-compatible format (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

37. As to claim 31, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including an apparatus for executing a remote procedure (214) in a remote processor (220) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (218), comprising: means for accepting a remote procedure call having at least one remote procedure input value (col.14, lines 35-40), and information identifying the remote procedure (214) including a global remote procedure locator means for transmitting the translated remote procedure call to the remote processor (220)(col.7, line 60 to col.8, line 10); means for interpreting the translated remote procedure call into a remote procedure-compatible format (col.1, lines 60-67,

col.7,lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, and fig.8A, 8B); and means for invoking the remote procedure (214) in the remote processor (220) to produce at least one remote procedure output value from the remote procedure input value (col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

38. As to claim 32, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: means for transmitting the remote procedure response to the local processor (218); means for interpreting the remote procedure response to a client process-compatible format and means for providing the translated remote procedure response to the client process (204) (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7,lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, and fig.8A, 8B); But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions

that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

39. As to claim 33, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the information identifying the remote procedure (214) further comprises a remote procedure remote identifier (col.21, lines 5-15).

40. As to claim 34, Kevner teaches the invention as claimed, including a program storage device, readable by a computer, tangibly embodying at least one program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps of executing a remote procedure (214) in a remote processor (220) from a client process (204) executed in a local processor (218), the method steps comprising the steps of: accepting a remote procedure call identifying the remote procedure (214) including a global remote procedure locator (col.9, lines 42-55); transmitting the translated remote procedure call to the remote processor (220) (col.9, lines 20-25); interpreting the translated remote procedure call into a remote procedure-compatible format (col.1, lines 60-67, col.7,lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, and fig.8A, 8B); and invoking the remote procedure (214) in the remote processor (220) (col.21, lines 16-20, col.10, lines 30-40, and col.11, lines 25-30). But Kever does not teach a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol. However, Tran a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol (col.26, lines 25-30, and col.28, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kevner and Tran to have a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol because it would have an efficient system that can provide

specific functions that transferring information between a World Wide Web server and any program is designed to accept and return data that conforms to the CGI specification. The program could be written in any programming language, including C, Perl, Java, or Visual Basic.

Response to Arguments

41. Applicant's arguments filled on November 1, 2004 have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

42. Applicants argue that neither Kevner nor Tran disclose or suggest translating a remote procedure call into a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol, and the means for doing that. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintain the rejection because Tran teaches translating a remote procedure call into a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol as shown in col.26, lines 25-30, col.28, lines 30-40, and col.1, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 15-23, col.9, lines 1-8, and fig.8A, 8B. Tran clearly shows translating a remote procedure call into a CGI-compatible information transfer protocol.

43. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

44. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 8, 13, 25, 28, 31, and 34. Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-24, 26-27, 29-30, 32, and 33 are also rejected at least by the virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action.

45. Accordingly, claims 1-34 are respectfully rejected.

Conclusion

46. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

47. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Bill Cuchlinski, may be reached at **(703) 308-3873**.

TTN
June 9, 2005

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER